DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 554 CS 213 487

AUTHOR Barbe, Katharina
TITLE Translation and Text-Analysis.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning (6th, Urbana, IL, April 2-4, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Discourse Analysis; Higher Education; Language Patterns; Language Research; Language Role; Linguistics; *Translation
IDENTIFIERS *Text Factors; *Textual Analysis

ABSTRACT

The primary goal of translation is to enable an audience in a Target Language to understand a text/discourse which was ultimately not intended for them. The primary goal of text-analysis is to further the understanding of phenomena inside one language. There are several similarities between translation and text-analysis: both translation and text-analysis involve the re-creation of text; the translator re-creates in the text language, the analyst, in some meta-language; and both the analyst and the translator need to be aware of all the possible relationships which hold in the text. An analysis of German conversation and its translation into American English demonstrate the unique position translation has, not only as an inter-language and inter-cultural means of study, but also as a tool of text-analysis. The survey provided by this paper illustrates that translation can support the analysis of texts/discourse in some instances, and, in the discussion of queries, even furthers that understanding. The field of contrastive linguistics lends support to the use of translation as inter-language comparison, and the combination of translation and text-analysis with contrastive linguistics can provide deeper insights into a pragmatic language description. Furthermore, by means of translation, certain pragmatic features appear which otherwise might not be accessible through mere intra-language comparison. Thus translation functions not only to distribute knowledge across language boundaries, but also to expand knowledge about the Source Language. (Thirty-three references are included.) (PRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TRANSLATION AND TEXT-ANALYSIS

Katharina Barbe

Northern Illinois University

ED349554

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Katharina Barbe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS213487

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TRANSLATION AND TEXT-ANALYSIS

Katharina Barbe

Northern Illinois University

In this paper I show how translation and text-analysis are connected, and how translation can also serve as a tool of text-analysis. Furthermore, by means of translation, certain pragmatic features appear which otherwise might not be accessible through mere intra-language comparison. Thus, translation functions not only to distribute knowledge across language boundaries, but also to expand knowledge about the Source Language.

INTRODUCTION

The primary goal of translation is to enable an audience in a Target Language (TL) to understand a text/discourse which was ultimately not intended for them. The primary goal of text-analysis[1] is to further the understanding of phenomena inside one language. In both approaches, the inter-language translation and the intra-language text-analysis, similar mechanisms are at play. In this paper, I want to discuss the similarities between translation and text-analysis. In addition, the analysis of German data and their translation into American English (AE) demonstrate the unique position translation has, not only as an inter-language and inter-culture means of study, but also as a tool of text-analysis. Translation helps to discover problems that can then be approached in analysis.

CS213487

The field of contrastive linguistics lends further support to the use of translation as inter-language comparison. "The phenomena to be accounted for in contrastive linguistics come most forcibly to attention in the course of careful translation" (Gleason 1968: p. 40). Wandruszka (1969) compared texts with their translations into other languages, to describe either a single language in more detail or similarities and differences between the compared languages. What language signifies for a speaker, what language achieves for him/her, is predominantly noticable when different languages are compared (my translation of Wandruszka 1969: p. 7). This sentiment is shared by other linguists and translation theorists like Hartmann (1981), Roos (1981), and Snell-Hornby (1986). The combination of translation and text-analysis with contrastive linguistics, thus, can provide deeper insights into a pragmatic language description.

TRANSLATION AND TEXT-ANALYSIS: A COMPARISON

Translation "is rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text" (Newmark 1988: p. 5).[2] To do so, we start either with single words, collocations, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, or the whole text. Regardless of the translation-method employed, the whole text is the ultimate criterion (cf. also Newmark 1988: p. 55).

The translator, just like the analyst, has to understand the text, show its intentions, recognize its attitude and discourse style (cf. Newmark 1988: p. 13). "Discourse analysis is the basis of any real translation" (Delisle 1988: p. 72).

Words translated in isolation just as words analyzed in isolation provide a distorted picture. "For the translator the main problem lies in the frequent discrepancy between lexemes viewed in isolation and their usage as words in context" (Snell-Hornby 1988: p. 96). The context is decisive in translation as well as in the analysis of discourse phenomena.

> "... translation begins with the text-in-situation as an integral part of the cultural background, whereby text-analysis proceeds from macro-structure of the text to the micro-unit of the word, this being seen, not as an isolatable item, but in its relevance and function within the text" (Snell-Hornby 1988: p.2).

Both translation and text-analysis involve the re-creation of text; the translator re-creates in the TL, the analyst in some meta-language. The analyst as well as the translator need to be aware of all the possible relationships which hold in the text, from single words to the whole text. "Anything re-stated is in fact a translation. Creation, interpretation, re-creation, translation, and adaption are more closely related than one might think" (Delisle 1988: p. 63). A successful text-analysis is even a pre-requisite for a good translation. Moreover, the relationship between translation and text-analysis is mutually beneficial. "Better than any analysis of a single language, translation demonstrates the fact that in discourse a word can have completely different meaning from the one normally associated with that word taken in isolation" (Delisle 1988: p. 47).

DATA-ANALYSIS

In the following, the intra-language analysis of each example precedes the examination of the information provided by the translation. The primary data for this study, a conversation among close friends, was recorded during an engagement party in Berlin, Germany. In the course of their conversation, the participants, all in their early 20s, talk about the engagement, in (1) referred to as Sache, which was a big surprise for most of them.

(1) Stefan: **War 'ne richtige adhoc Sache irgendwie, wa**

[Was a real adhoc thing somehow]

Martha: **Ja, spontaaan, nich Anna? Haha!**

[Yeah, spontaneous, wasn't it, Anna?]

Helga: **Ganz spontan**

[Truly spontaneous]

The "incompleteness" of Stefan's utterance, i.e., the omitted subject, the truncated ne (from eine), the wa-tag (a sign of Berlin dialect, Berlinerisch in the following) give evidence of informal speech. I use the terms "truncated", "incomplete", etc., with reservation. They imply that utterances can be complete or incomplete. Usually, each utterance is as complete as the conversation and the intentions and abilities of the speakers require. Stefan has a certain discourse purpose in mind which even requires this "incompleteness".

Martha's remark also lacks a surface subject. Nevertheless, just like Stefan's, her remark suffices in the colloquial context. Had Martha spoken very formally in a grammatically complete and correct manner, the other participants would have

considered that a violation of the "party-dicourse-mode". With her remark, which was understood as ironic, she teases Anna. With her use of a nich-tag, Martha intends her remark to be taken like a punch line. She neither wants nor expects any response from Anna. However, she expects agreement with her proposition from the other participants.

On the discourse level the irony is based on the adhoc - spontan relationship and on the lengthening of spontaaan. However, these clues are not inconclusive. It is doubtful, that an outsider will be able to deduce that spontaneity is not one of Anna's characteristics. In this instance, the most important signal is not a linguistic one, it is prior knowledge of Anna's inflexibility. Then the irony becomes more obvious: Anna's known inflexibility is juxtaposed with adhoc - spontan. Anna does have some possible responses, among others; (a) noticing the irony, she could be offended and express this sentiment, (b) she could decide not to notice the irony and take Martha's query as a question, and answer accordingly, (c) she could come up with some smart repartee, or (d) she could just not react at all, which is what she did. An observer to the exchange, Helga, notices the irony and expresses agreement with Martha.

The translation of this exchange into colloquial AE seems to be without problems on the basis of the constituent words. The omission of the subject das in Stefan's and Martha's utterances is easily translated, without loss of the colloquial flavor. The "incompleteness" of the participants' utterances are signs of colloquial language not only in German but also in AE. The omission of the subject is also possible in AE without major

distortion of the meaning. However, just as a text-analyst, a translator has to account somehow for unfinished sentences, interruptions, repairs, false starts, etc. All are signs of spontaneous conversation and consequently must appear in the TL-version to preserve the flavor of the utterance.

Having the requisite background-knowledge, a TL-speaker can also understand the irony in the translation. Although irony is generally described as a very culture-specific phenomenon, at least in this instance, German and American culture have a similar understanding of irony.

But, upon further examination, the translation of Stefan's utterance becomes puzzling. A translator has to decide if War 'ne richtige adhoc Sache irgendwie, wa is a question or a comment. With the tag wa, Stefan tries to elicit agreement, which is, however, not necessarily a requirement for a question.

Stefan's utterance should be disambiguated when intonation is considered. However, Stefan does not use the question intonation, even though he stresses wa. But how does he want his remark to be understood? To explain further, let us look at the following examples:[3]

(2) **War heute schön**

[Was nice today]

(3) **Ist alles fertig**

[Everything is ready / Is everything ready]

(4) **Sind alle fertig**

[Everybody is ready / Is everybody ready]

Also (2), (3), and (4) are ambiguous as to their discourse function. If said very forcefully, with a rather flat

intonation, i.e., without the typical question-intonation, they can elicit either (a) some type of comment, (b) agreement or (c) disagreement.

(2a) **Wieso?**

[Why?]

(2b) **Fand ich auch**

[I agree]

(2c) **Ganz und garnicht**

[Not at all]

(3a) **Toll**

[Great]

(3b) **Ja**

[Yeah]

(3c) **Nein**

[No]

(4a) **Endlich**

[Finally]

(4b) **Ja, wir können jetzt gehen**

[Yes, let's leave now]

(4c) **Nein, hetz mich doch nicht immer so**

[No, what's the hurry]

(2a), (3a), and (4a) are responses to a statement, in terms of either a doubting question (2a), a sign of praise (3a), or of impatience (4a). (2b), (2c), (3b), (3c) and (4b), (4c) are responses to an assumed yes/no-questions. Thus, we find that there exist some "non-questions" in German, all using a form of sein [to be], which do not fit into any model developed so far.[4]

Similarly, the following example also includes "non-questions".

(5)

Stefan: **Ja, anstossen könn wa ooch noch ma**

[Let's drink to their health again]

Anna: **Am liebsten mit andern Gläsern wa Stefan?**

[Preferably with other people's glasses, right Stefan]

Stefan: **War des deins? Keine ansteckenden Krankheiten, gloob ick jedenfalls**

[Was this yours. No communicable diseases,

at least I hope so]

Anna's utterance shows the traditional question intonation, which she even intensifies with the wa-tag. She expects some apology or at least acknowledgement from Stefan.

Stefan in turn replies with what appears to be a question. War des deins shows all the signs of a yes/no-question complete with the rising intonation and first position of the verb. Stefan, however, asks the 'question' after the 'response', implied in Anna's statement, had already been given. Usually, we expect an answer to follow a question, not to precede it (cf. Schegloff and Sacks 1973). Stefan does not expect an answer at all.

Stefan's utterance can also not be considered a rhetorical question, even though it fits the description of a rhetorical question, namely, a question "without intent to elicit information" (Frank 1990: p. 730) but trying to elicit agreement. The question here rather functions as an expression of surprise coupled with an apology. It could perhaps be

considered as an "echo-question" in terms of Green (1989: p. 155). Stefan's question and the examples provided by Green (e.g., "He did what?") both share the element of surprise. However, apology is not included in the definition of "echo-questions". Stefan's apology is insincere, because he invalidates it immediately by teasing Anna: He assures Anna that he does not have any diseases and that she can safely keep drinking from the glass in question, thereby alluding to her known fear of germs.

The translation of (5) also does not pose any major hurdles, except again for those "non-questions".

In the following example, Carl is talking about a better place for the tape-recorder, which was prominently displayed.

(6) Carl: **Auf's Klo hinstelln, ha! Das muß sich automatisch einschaltn Mensch[5], die Leute dürfen das ... natürlich nichts davon wissen. Ja, oh, da komm Sachen raus**

[Put (it)[6] in the john. It has to turn itself on automatically, people should ... of course not notice it. Yeah, a lot of stuff is going to come out]

Martha: **Natürlich sonst würdense ja nich uffs Klo jehn.**

[Of course, otherwise they wouldn't go to the john.]

Carl omits the subject (man or du) as well as the object (es / das Tonbandgerät) in Auf's Klo hinstellen, ha! Object omission is not possible in English in this instance, but the subject does not need to be expressed. There must then be some criteria that govern incompleteness: When is an incomplete sentence still pragmatically acceptable?

Carl achieves the colloquial flavor not only by ellipsis but also by his choice of words. He chooses Klo instead of the more polite Bad or Toilette. Klo, a synechdoche, does not only signify the bathroom as a whole but also the commode itself (in British English we could perhaps translate Klo with 'loo'). Nevertheless, Carl meant his suggestion to be taken seriously. He did not intend the interpretation Martha gave to his utterances. However, the ambiguity of rauskommen - 'come out', 'get out', or 'find out' left a place for Martha to jump in. Carl intended 'find out' but his audience "misunderstood" 'come out'. After a bathroom visit it can jokingly be said 'Did everything come out ok?' Example (6) constitutes another instance of irony. Carl becomes an ironist against his will, whereas Martha intends her ironic remark. In order to understand the irony here, no prior knowledge of the speakers involved is necessary. Except for the incompleteness, the exchange translates easily.

With (7) Stefan reacts to the previous exchange:

(7) Stefan: **Fäkalästhetiker wo is der Wodka?**

[Fecal aestheticist, where is the vodka?]

He combines a comment to the Carl/Martha exchange with a request towards the hostess by juxtaposing a nonce-lexeme with a seemingly unimportant question all in one breath. Stefan, intentionally or unintentionally, uses a technique common to sitcoms, which usually involves a revolving door. The addressee leaves through this door as if nothing had happened, only to return incredulously, wanting to re-check the last utterance. The same thing happened here. Only at some time later in the

conversation does one participant catch on to the outrageousness of the utterance and then attempts to "publicize" it.

A translator will not find the term Fäkalästhetiker in any dictionary, not even in a dictionary of contemporary German. Translation of Fäkalästhetiker requires a nonce-form also in the TL, i.e., it leaves the translator to exercise his or her lexical creativity. The translation of nonce-forms has not been discussed in detail in the relevant literature. Newmark (1988) considers these neologisms "the non-literary and the professional translator's biggest problem" and defines them "as newly coined lexical units or existing lexical units that acquire a new sense" (p. 140).

Nonce-forms are not only culture-specific but also very situation-dependent and personal. Like idioms, many nonce-creations have been integrated ino the language and are now no longer recognizable as such. But, because of the obvious taboo-connotations involved, it is doubtful if Stefan's creation would ever find its way into mainstream German.

Up to now, we were able to discover two areas, "non-questions" and nonce-lexemes, with the help of translation. Example (8) highlights yet another problem, the use of American English (AE) in German.

(8) Martha: **Da hat er da mit so dussligen Fremdwörtern arjumentiert, ja nich jescheckt**

[He argued with such silly foreign words, didn't get it]

Martha complains about the inappropriate use of Fremdwörter by a fellow student, who, she thought, wanted to sound intellectual. But then she turns around and uses Fremdwörter

herself. She juxtaposes Fremdwörter with arjumentieren and jescheckt (arjumentiert - Berlinerisch version of the standard argumentiert; jescheckt - Berlinerisch version of past participle of schecken - gescheckt.) Gescheckt/gecheckt is a recent loan from AE with the meaning of 'fathom' or 'examine' (Küpper 1987). 'Argued' has been incorporated into the English language and would no longer be considered a 'foreign word' at least to the same extent as argumentieren in German is still considered a Fremdwort.

'Foreign words' seems to be an inadequate translation of Fremdwörter, mainly because foreign words do not play as prominent a role in English as they do in German. Fremdwörter can be considered an institution in German. "The important thing is the association behind the word. The English equivalent of the German who talks in Fremdwörtern is the man who uses latinized language" (Snell 1978: p. 198). It is most important for a speaker using Fremdwörter that he/she knows where to put the stress. These words, mostly of Latin or Greek origin, have been borrowed with the original stress. Failing to use the right stress, a speaker shows his/her lack of education.

Utterance (8) can be translated into AE, however, no possible translation will show the same SL-connotations for jescheckt in the TL. Even though we can find a few German loans in AE (for example, 'ersatz' and 'angst'), the context of the use and the prestige of foreign languages in the US (predominantly, French, German, and Spanish) are not comparable to the prestige and the use of AE in Germany. Historical circumstances (like the continued presence of American soldiers

in the now former West-Germany and West-Berlin) as well as American leadership in pop-culture and technology prove responsible for AE prestige. The Germans have even coined a word for the extended usage of AE -- Amerikanismus.

Numerous Amerikanismen can be found in newspapers and magazines. Recent issues of Der Spiegel, a national news-magazine or Zitty, a Berlin-magazine, give evidence: Die Bodyguards bewachen einen Mythos [the bodyguards guard a myth] (Spiegel 32/92: p. 178) in an article about Bobby Fischer. An article about TV and Computers uses hightechnischen Raum [high-tech area], Computerfreaks, and Mailboxen (Zitty 17/92: p. 206). An advertisement-executive describes an advertisment for a cigarette as lonesome hero mit Loch im Schuh [lonesome hero with a hole in the shoe], and criticizes himself with aber ich weiß natürlich, daß das Bullshit ist [but, of course, I know it's bullshit] (ibid.: p. 199). Langeweile und Coolheit [boredom and being cool] are juxtaposed (ibid.: p. 200). These phenomena have been studied extensively,[7] but not, however, from the point of view of what to do with them when translating into AE.

DISCUSSION

The survey illustrated that translation can support the analysis of texts/discourse in some instances, and, in the discussion of queries, even furthers the understanding. Thus, we can divide the usefulness of translation for text-analysis into two areas:

(I) translation furthers the understanding

(II) translation supports previous conclusions

Particularly in the discussion of what I have called "non-questions", translation played a role in the discovery of these phenomena. "Non-questions" as well as tag-questions and rhetorical questions, as they appeared above in (1) - (5) deserve further attention. A detailed pragmatic analysis should illustrate the special features of these questions, and compare "non-questions" with question-types previously studied.

Furthermore, a contrastive study of the definitions and possibilities of "incompleteness" should prove valuable not only to the translator but also to the analyst. We have found so far that subject omission is possible in AE and German in the cases discussed above. Object omission, however, was only possible in German. Does this hold true in other instances, for different grammatical features? Can the same features be omitted in German and English?

Nonce-forms also deserve further study, even though no unified approach can be possible due to the nature of these forms. However, as the translation of nonce-forms makes us aware, translation is not only a bi-lingual and bi-cultural affair but also a personal one.

We have also run into major problems concerning the translation of Amerikanismen. As Amerikanismen find their way more and more into German, they are not only found in advertisement, newspapers, and magazines but also in recent German literature. Thus, the translation of Amerikanismen becomes a legitimate area of inquiry which merits further investigation.

In the cases of irony discussed above, the translation supports previous conclusions. Irony is a highly cultural phenomenon. The discussion of irony in conversation poses similar problems in German and AE, which indicates similar cultural experiences. Examples (1) and (2) show that ironic instances can cross culture boundaries. Furthermore, they point to some commonality in the treatment of irony in the two cultures. Irony has been variously described in linguistic-pragmatic terms (Roy 1978, Kaufer 1981, Sperber/Wilson 1981, Barbe 1989, Littman/Mey 1991, and others). However, a contrastive study of irony has, as of yet, not been attempted.

CONCLUSION

I have shown the similarity and the relationship between translation and text-analysis. Text-analysis is the basis for translation; translation, then, can re-influence text-analysis by helping to discover pragmatic problems which merit further investigation. Translation, thus, functions here not only to distribute knowledge across language boundaries, but also to expand our knowledge about the Source Language.

> ... when translation is properly understood as something more than mere decoding, we realize that it suggests ... other ways of being in the world (Tyler 1978: p. 70).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This article is a revised version of a paper presented at the Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning at the University of Illinois on April 4, 1992.

THE AUTHOR

Katharina Barbe is Assistant Professor of German in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at Northern Illinois University. Her research interests include Second Language Acquisition, Translation Theory, and Pragmatics.

NOTES

1. I understand text-analysis to imply the pragmatic analysis of spoken as well as written communication. In this paper, I am looking at spontaneous spoken communication. In my analysis, I follow Sacks and Schegloff.

2. There is a lot of discussion about this point, e.g.: What are the author's intention? Are the author's intentions more important than each reader's interpretations? Nevertheless, I think, this statement captures well the intentions of most translators.

3. Examples (2) - (4) are constructed.

4. I have looked at Lakoff (1973), Baumert (1977), Kiefer (1983), Levinson (1983), Green (1989), all of them, of course, deal primarily with English. However, publications dealing with German questions did not discuss these types of

questions, Bühler et al. (1973), Wunderlich (1975), Braun (1989), Brinker/Sager (1989).

5. Mensch, translated in other contexts with 'human being', is used here as an exclamation, somewhat like an intensifier, remotely comparable to 'you guys', 'oh man' or 'you all'. Often used interchangeably with Mann in utterances like Mensch, das mußt du doch wissen [you really should have known this] or Mensch, war der doof [man, that guy was really stupid], it can also be paraphrased with weißte [you know] or wirklich [really]. Die Leute [the people] could conceivably also be 'nobody' or 'everybody'.

6. {} indicates that the object 'it' needs to be expressed in English.

7. Carstenson 1971, Braun 1979, Viereck 1986, and many others.

REFERENCES

Barbe, K. (1989) Irony in Conversational German: A Linguistic Approach. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.

Baumert, M. (1977) Classification of English Question-Answer structure. Journal of Pragmatics 1, 85-92.

Braun, P. (ed.) (1979) Fremdwort-Diskussion. München: Wilhelm Funk.

--------- (1987) Tendenzen in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Brinker, K. and S.F. Sager (1989) Linguistische Gesprächs-analyse. Berlin: Erich Schmidt.

Bühler, H. et al. (1973) Funk-Kolleg Sprache II. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.

Carstenson, B. (1971) Spiegel-Wörter. Spiegel-Worte. München.

Delisle, J. (1988) Translation: An Interpretative Approach. Ottawa, Canada: University of Ottawa Press.

Frank, J. (1990) You call that a rhetorical question? Journal of Pragmatics 14, 723-738.

Gleason, H.A. (1968) Contrastive Analysis in Discourse Structure'. J.A. Alatis (ed.) 19th Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Green, G. (1989) Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hartmann, R.R.K. (1981) Contrastive Textology and Translation. W. Kühlwein, G. Thome, W. Wilss, (eds.) Kontrastive Linguistik und Übersetzungswissenschaften. Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums Trier/Saarbrücken

Kaufer, D. S. (1981) Understanding ironic communication. Journal of Pragmatics 5, 495-510.

Kiefer, F. (ed.) (1983) Questions and Answers. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Küpper, H. (1987) Pons Wörterbuch der deutschen Umgangssprache. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag.

Lakoff, R. (1973) Questionable Answers and Answerable Questions. Kachru, B.B. (ed.) Issues in Linguistics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Littmann, D.C. and J. L. Mey (1991). The nature of irony. Journal of Pragmatics 15, 131-151.

Levinson, S. (1983) Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newmark, P. (1988) A Textbook of Translation. New York: Prentice Hall.

Roos, E., 1981. Contrastive Analysis and the Translation of Idioms. W. Kühlwein, G. Thome, W. Wilss, eds.

Roy, A. M. (1978) Irony in Conversation. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.

Schegloff, E.A. and Sacks, H. (1973) Opening up closings. Semiotica VIII, 289-327.

Snell, M. (1978) german - english prose translation. München: Hueber.

Snell-Hornby, M. (ed.), (1986) Übersetzungswissenschaften - Eine Neuorientierung. Tübingen: Francke.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1988) Translation Studies - An Integrated Approach. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1990) A Critique of Translation Theory in Germany. S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere (eds.) Translation, History and Culture. London: Pinter Publishers.

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson (1981) Irony and the use-mention distinction. P. Cole Radical Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.

Der Spiegel 32 (1992)

Tyler, S. (1978) The Said and the Unsaid. New York: Academic Press.

Viereck, W. (1980) Studien zum Einfluß der englischen Sprache auf das Deutsche. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Wandruszka, M. (1969) Sprachen: vergleichbar und unvergleichlich. München: Piper.

Wunderlich, D. (ed.) Linguistische Pragmatik. Wiesbaden: Athenaion.

Zitty 17 (1992)